

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this application is requested. Claims 2, 4 and 5 will be active in the application subsequent to entry of this Amendment.

Restriction Requirement

The pending claims have been amended and all are directed to the elected subject matter, namely an exhaust gas treatment method. The examiner will note, as explained in more detail below, the subject matter of claim 1 has been incorporated into claim 5 making claim 5 an independent claim. Claims 2 and 4 have been rewritten/amended and directed to an exhaust gas treatment method while the subject matter of claim 3 has been incorporated into claim 5 as well. Claims 6 and 7 have been canceled. It will be understood that cancellation of the non-elected subject matter is without disclaimer and without prejudice to continuing applications directed to the subject matter of the canceled/non-elected claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statement filed July 25, 2006 included three line-throughs. Two of them related to published Japanese applications and were lined through, according to the Official Action, as not being in the English language and thus the relevance was not understood. With this response is a further Information Disclosure Statement, relevant fee being paid, in which English translations of these two documents are supplied.

Also lined-through was a PCT published application WO 2005/072853 which is the published version (in Japanese) of the PCT application of which the present application is a national stage entry which of course the examiner has already considered.

Response to Lack of Clarity Rejection Under 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph

The examiner questions the groups listed in claim 5 and notes that they are inconsistent with the description of the invention as to the same groups but for changing b to a. The examiner's comment is well taken and claim 5 has been amended to correct this. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC §102 – Anticipation

Claim 5 as previously presented stands rejected as being anticipated by JP '520 however this rejection is no longer pertinent to claim 5 as above amended.

Claim 5 has been amended to further include the technical feature of "the specific surface area of the exhaust gas treatment agent is $1 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ or more".

In the present invention, in the case of a reaction between SiF_4 and the Ca agent, CaSiO_3 is formed on the surface and this CaSiO_3 cannot be removed with an F compound. Consequently, the calcium agent (Ca agent) of the present invention reacts to a depth of about 1 nm in the direction of depth, namely down to the third molecular layer. Thus, the specific surface area of the Ca agent is preferably $1 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ or more.

This is in contrast to JP '520 which does not describe or suggest a catalyst having the specific surface area of $1 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ or more, and the prominent effects describe above (*see* the specification, page 21, lines 17 to 23).

Therefore, the present invention is not anticipated by JP '520, and accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

For the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 4 and 5, as above amended, are in proper order, directed to elected subject matter and not anticipated by the cited reference. Reconsideration and allowance are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYTE P.C.

By: 

Arthur R. Crawford
Reg. No. 25,327

ARC:eaw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100